

U.S. Appln. No. 10/090,861  
Reply to Office Action dated May 5, 2005

PATENT  
450117-03754

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

### **I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS**

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13-15, 17 and 20 are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed. No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claims, 6, 9-10, and 18 contain allowable subject matter.

### **II. OBJECTIONS**

Initially, in paragraph 1 of the office action the Examiner has objected to the specification as failing to provide a definition for the term Eigenpronunciation. The Examiner's attention is directed to page 7 lines 35-37, which refers to the term Eigenpronunciation as "sets of pronunciation rules." Accordingly, it is submitted that the specification does provide a definition for this term. With regard to the distinguishing features of claims 5 and 6 it is submitted that this definition makes clear that claim 6 is different in scope than claim 5, from which it depends. Accordingly, it is requested that the objection to the specification for the definition of Eigenpronunciation be withdrawn.

U.S. Appl. No. 10/090,861  
Reply to Office Action dated May 5, 2005

PATENT  
450117-03754

In response to the Examiner's objections in paragraphs 3-5, it is respectfully submitted that the specification has been amended, above, to overcome these objections. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

In paragraphs 6-13, the office action addresses certain claim informalities. It is submitted that by these amendments the lack of antecedent basis discussed in paragraphs 7, 8, 10, 11, and 13 has been addressed. Further, it is submitted that with respect to paragraph 9, the Examiner intended for the objection to address claim 11 and not claim 12, this lack of proper antecedent basis has also been addressed by these amendments. With regard to paragraph 12, it is submitted that by reference to the definition provided above for the term Eigenpronunciation, the Examiner's concerns regarding claims 5 and 6 have been addressed. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objections to the claims.

### **III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The office action rejects claims 11, 13-17, and 20 for inclusion of language such as "and/or the like." In response, claims 11, 13-17, and 20 have been amended to remove this language. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 11, 13-17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

### **IV. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The office action rejects claims 1-5, 7-8, 12-14, 17, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,127,055 to Larkey in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,255,342 to Nitta.

Independent claim 1 has been amended herein to recite steps of:

projecting said current pronunciation (CP) into said  
pronunciation space (PS);

U.S. Appin. No. 10/090,851  
Reply to Office Action dated May 5, 2005

PATENT  
450117-03754

calculating distance values (d1, ..., d4) with respect to Eigenpronunciations (E1, ..., E4); determining a lowest distance value (d4); and  
choosing a set of pronunciation rules as said approximate set of pronunciation rules (APR) which correspond to the Eigenpronunciation (E4) being assigned to said lowest distance value (d4).

It is respectfully submitted that the relied upon portions of Larkey and Nitta do not teach such features. Accordingly, independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the relied upon portions of the cited references and is allowable.

#### **V. DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

#### **CONCLUSION**

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.


Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

U.S. Appl. No. 10/090,861  
Reply to Office Action dated May 5, 2005

PATENT  
450117-03754

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicants

By   
Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442  
(212) 588-0800